arXiv:1609.07719v1 [math.NA] 25 Sep 2016



Marco Favino, Rolf Krause, Igor Pivkin

A survey on stochastic multi-scale modeling in biomechanics: computational challenges

ICS Preprint No. 2016-01

23 September 2016

Via Giuseppe Buffi 13 • CH-6904 Lugano • phone: +41 58 666 4690 • fax: +41 58 666 4536 •
http://ics.unisi.ch

A survey on stochastic multi-scale modeling in biomechanics: computational challenges

Marco Favino* Rolf Krause* Igor V. Pivkin*

September 27, 2016

Abstract

During the last decade, multi-scale models in mechanics, bio-mechanics and life sciences have gained increasing attention. Using multi-scale approaches, effects on different time and length scales, such as, e.g., cellular and organ scale, can be coupled and their interaction can be studied. Clearly, this requires the development of new mathematical models and numerical methods for multi-scale problems, in order to provide reliable and efficient tools for the investigation of multi-scale effects. Here, we give an overview on existing numerical approaches for multi-scale simulations in bio-mechanics with particular emphasis on stochastic effects.

1 Introduction

Computational Science, i.e. the study, development, and use of algorithms, methods and simulations tools, has become indispensable for research and experimentation in science, engineering, medicine, and technology, cf. [BL05]. Physical experiments can very often be replaced by a "virtual experiment", i.e. a simulation. Classical simulation approaches like finite elements are routinely used in research and industry by now, and computational methods like Molecular Dynamics (MD) allow for a detailed investigation of effects on small scales, for example for the design of new materials and drugs.

In fact, looking from a single-scale and single-physics point of view, current simulation methods are quite elaborated. The existing methods for solving ordinary differential equations (ODEs) or partial differential equations (PDEs) have reached a high level of maturity: accuracy control, adaptivity, efficiency and robustness can be guaranteed for a large range of problem classes, which can be modeled by, e.g., initial or boundary value problems involving ODEs or PDEs.

Many of the underlying mathematical models, however, have been developed from a deterministic point of view with the idea of reducing the complexity of

*Institute of Computational Science, Università della Svizzera italiana, Lugano, Switzerland

a physical or biological phenomena. Thus, the classical "deterministic single-physics, single-scale" approach has several limitations. Firstly, most deterministic methods aim at the computation of a single solution or a single trajectory, which is usually assumed or even known to be uniquely determined by the initial data and the chosen parameters. For most biological and bio-mechanical applications, however, relevant parameters or other data such as, e.g., the computational domain, are not exactly known. As a consequence, the value of the information which can be obtained from a single trajectory computed for one given set of data is restricted. Secondly, information on the sensitivity of the problem with respect to perturbations in the data can not be obtained directly from such a simulation. Thirdly, many processes on small length- and time-scales in biology and bio-mechanics might be modeled best using stochastic approaches. The interaction of these stochastic effects in the micro scale (cell level or below) with deterministic processes on the macro-scale (organ level or above) is also not easily possible within the framework of classical deterministic simulations.

These limitations have simply been caused by the fact that computational models had (and have) to be designed in order to make the results of a simulation run accessible in reasonable time. With the ever growing computational capabilities of modern super-computers, however, the restrictions in terms of computational time become less important, thus opening new perspectives for the modeling and simulation of complex and coupled systems. As of 2014, we have super-computers available which deliver up to 34 petaFLOPs [SDS$^+$14] and exaFLOP machines are expected in the near future. Thus, in principle there is sufficient computational power available in order to carry out even very demanding simulations involving different length and time scales and different models.

In parallel to the growth of computational capabilities, within the last three decades various new numerical approaches have been developed. In particular uncertainty quantification, sensitivity analysis, multi-scale effects, coupled and complex systems, and the influences of random processes have been driving factors. They have been employed to different biomedical applications, such as remodeling and growth of tissues (e.g., wound healing, bone healing, tumor growth), modeling of cardiovascular system, muscular activation, and electrophysiology. Thus, we are currently facing the transition from a more deterministic single-physics approach towards a broader class of mathematical models and numerical methods, which are capable of dealing with complex systems involving multiple scales and stochastic effects. These new methods give rise to a wide range of new possibilities in terms of simulation and prediction of biological and bio-mechanical systems.

In this paper, we aim towards an overview on existing multi-scale approaches and their numerical treatment with particular emphasis on stochastic effects. We will focus especially on bio-mechanical applications. We will also include methods which have been developed in computational mechanics, as we believe that the underlying concepts and ideas are also relevant for computational bio-mechanics.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that -naturally- the references given in this paper are far from complete. If the given references appear to be selected randomly, we kindly ask the reader to interpret this in the broader context of the stochastic approaches considered here.

2 Multi-scale Approaches

2.1 High Resolution Approaches

The possibly most straightforward approach to treating different length-scales in bio-mechanics might be the usage of high resolution models based on single-scale models. Here, prominent example is the simulation of trabecular bone using the so called micro-finite element method: a high resolution finite element mesh is used which allows for resolving the structure of the trabeculae. Naturally, this approach finds it limits where the material does not behave as a continuum any more, as this is a necessary prerequisite for the application of continuum based material models and the finite element method. The resulting large scale systems are then solved using established and well scaling fast iterative methods as multigrid methods on massively parallel machines [AvLM$^+$08]. In the case of non-linear material models, the situation is more complex, but it can be handled efficiently even for the arising large scale systems, cf., e.g., [CWM10]. These high resolution models, which have been originally designed for simulating the mechanical behaviour of the bone, have also been extended in order to investigate, e.g., bone-cell response to mechanical stimuli [LCGP06]. In [GWvLM09] it is argued that, in order to model and simulate this interaction more accurately, hierchical models should be developed and employed. An approach to stochastic modeling can be found in [TMBM94]. Here, stoachastic effects are added to a continuum based model.

2.2 Concurrent Multi-Scale Models

The development of coupled multi-scale models has been starting about 20-25 years ago in different fields. We refer to the survey [GZC14], where an overview by scientific communities can be found. There, Astrophysics, Biology, Energy, Engineering, Environmental and Material Sciences are identified as major fields for multi-scale simulations. Additional surveys on multi-scale models can be found in [CM03, PL04, BCC$^+$04, ELVE04].

An important choice in multi-scale modelling is whether to decompose the problem hierarchically or to use a concurrent approach, in which the different scales are treated simultaneously. Clearly, this also makes a difference from the numerical point of view.

In the first case the different scales can be treated separately and in a sequential manner. The transfer of information between the different scales is often realised by exchanging parameters, usually from fine to coarse: computations on the micro-scale are used to determine certain parameters on the macro-scale.

We refer to [BLL02, AG05] and to Section 3 for more details on this approach.

In the second case, i.e. the concurrent case, the different models and scales interact and influence each other directly during the computation. In computational mechanics, the most prominent multi-scale methods are designed for the coupling of MD on the micro-scale and finite elements on the macro-scale. We refer to Figure 1 for an example from fracture mechanics illustrating this concept. Here, a MD solution around the crack tip is combined with a finite element simulation "far away"from the crack. In these applications, the solution methods are based on a spatial decomposition of the computational domain, which can be non-overlapping, partially overlapping, or fully overlapping. Examples are the coupling of length scales method, which uses a non-overlapping decomposition with a lower-dimensional interface for coupling [BABK99], the Bridging Domain method by Belytschko and Xiao, which uses a transition domain for the information transfer between the scales, and the bridging scale method by Liu et al. [WL03], which is designed for the fully overlapping case but then reduces the size of the atomistic region by using absorbing boundary conditions outside the "region of interest". Recently, these methods have been extended to include also the randomness of the material structures using homogenization approaches, see [YCT$^+$08, LQG$^+$10] and the references cited therein. In this context, also the Arleqiun method has to be mentioned, which provides a general approach to multi-scale coupling in particular in mechanics, see [Dhi98]. In addition to multi-scale approaches where MD and finite elements are coupled,



Figure 1: Coupling between Molecular Dynamics and Finite Elements (Mode-I fracture).

also other coupled models exist. An example can be found in [MKSB11], where finite elements are coupled with discrete automata for modeling tumors.

We finally note that sometimes also multi-dimensional models are referred to as multi-scale models. Here, $1d$ (often ODEs) and $3d$ models (often PDEs) are coupled, see [GSS$^+$14, PdLF$^+$09, KJ10]. The fully overlapping case is described in more detail in Section 3.3.

Scale Transfer A particular challenge in the framework of coupled multi-scale simulations is the transfer of discrete fields –in mechanics usually displacements

and stresses– between the different scales. By design, the models on the different scales will have different characteristics. It is well known that a simple and straightforward coupling of MD and finite elements leads to spurious oscillations and/or to the so called "ghost forces" at the coupling interface, which can spoil the accuracy of the simulation. Moreover, in MD the displacement of the atoms are pointwise given quantities, whereas in a continuum based model such as finite elements the computed displacements live in a suitable function space (usually the Sobolev space H^1). From neither a physical nor a mathematical point of view it is possible to identify finite element displacements with MD displacements directly. Instead, a suitable transfer operator has to be derived which allows for a stable and seamless transfer of discrete fields between the different models. See [FKKL11] and the references therein for details on this aspect.

A similar -but less severe- problem shows up with respect to the discretization in time. Here, the different time scales of MD and continuum based approaches have to be taken into account. One possibility is to use time integrators as the SHAKE-RATTLE integrator [HLW00], which is a standard symplectic integrator for constrained Hamiltonian systems.

2.3 Coarse Graining

A fundamental problem for numerical simulations on the molecular scale is the fact that the currently feasible time- and length scales are still too small for many practical applications. Although standard simulations tools in MD show excellent scaling behaviour also on larger parallel machines, the computation times needed for simulations in classical MD are still very high: an example might be the simulation of a complex virus in a time range of about a milli-second. In order to address this problem, so called coarse grained (CG) methods have been introduced, which aim at using coarser scales in space and time without sacrificing too much the microscopic information, see, e.g., [Vot09, NLSK04]. Although there is a huge variety of CG models available in the literature, they share the common idea of partitioning the system into single interaction centres, the so called "beads". For this in-space-reduced system, the CG potentials are derived, which provide the effective force field for the interaction of the CG particles or beads. Often, these CG potentials are given in a parametrised form and they aim at preserving structural properties observed in atomistic simulations. Examples are approximations based on the potential of mean force [SSR$^+$01, MBF$^+$00] or the inverse Monte Carlo technique [MFP$^+$04] and Inverse Boltzmann. CG potentials might also be designed to preserve thermodynamic properties [SSR$^+$01, MdVM04, MRY$^+$07, MKP$^+$08].

Multi-scale Coarse-Graining (MSCG) [IV05] is a different class of CG potentials that uses information from high-resolution simulations or models for building the CG potential. This is usually done by means of a force matching method [IPBV04, EA94]. For the analysis of MSCG in the framework of statistical mechanics, see [NaGSAK$^+$08a, NaGSAK$^+$08b]. From a numerical point of view, the computational effort for CG simulations can be reduced by choos-

ing a new multi-resolution basis [DA12b, DA12a]. With respect to stochastic approaches, combinations of CG approaches with Monte-Carlo methods have been derived and analyzed, see [KMV03].

In terms of biological and biomechanical applications, CG models have been used for simulating the behaviour of platelet aggregation as a stochastic process [PRK06]. Also on the cellular level, in [VG12] an approach is presented which incorporates cell death and proliferation as stochastic processes. A multi-scale description for wound healing using different models on cellular, cell colony, and tissue scale is described in [VG13].

2.4 Dissipative Particle Dynamics

Dissipative particle dynamics (DPD) is a relatively new, potentially very effective particle-based approach, which was applied in simulations of physical and biological systems from atomistic to macroscopic size. The DPD model consists of particles ("beads") which correspond to coarse-grained entities, representing clusters of atoms or molecules [HK92, PCK10]. The size of these clusters, which defines the level of coarse-graining in DPD simulations, can vary by many orders of magnitude in different applications. For simple fluids, the DPD particles interact with each other via pairwise forces, e.g., conservative, dissipative, and random [GW97]. All forces in DPD conserve linear and angular momenta. Conservative force in DPD is derived from soft quadratic potential and its magnitude depends on the physical system. Dissipative force takes into account dissipation of energy due to friction forces. Stochastic component of the DPD, the random force, takes into account the degrees of freedom which were eliminated as a result of coarse-graining. Dissipative and random forces form DPD thermostat [EW95]. In simulations of complex systems other forces are usually added, which include bonded interactions, angle potentials, etc. Unlike MD, where the choice of forces is based on a theoretical model of the physical system to be simulated, the DPD model involves forces of a form independent on the physical system. Therefore, parameters in DPD simulations have to be carefully chosen in applications.

Two interpretations of the DPD method exist. According to the first one, DPD can be considered as a stochastic CG molecular dynamics [GW97]. Here, each DPD particle corresponds to a cluster of a small number of atoms or molecules, typically in the range between 3 and 10. In this case, the most common process of choosing DPD simulation parameters for fluid systems is based on assuming that the dimensionless compressibility of the DPD fluid is equal to the dimensionless compressibility of the physical fluid [GW97, KPMK05]. The time scale is defined by matching the diffusion constant of the molecule of interest [Gro00, GR01] or vorticity [KPMK05]. The level of coarse-graining in this interpretation of the DPD is limited however [Tro03, PK06]. For systems containing water it is usually less than 10 water molecules per single DPD particle. Nevertheless, due to the soft potentials employed in DPD, the time scales are typically quite large comparing to MD, resulting in speed-up factors of more than 10^4 [GW97].

The second interpretation of the DPD method is based on the fact that DPD forces conserve linear and angular momenta. As a result, DPD provides correct description of the hydrodynamic interactions in simulations even with relatively small number of particles [Esp95]. Here, each DPD particle can correspond to a cluster of a very large number of atoms or molecules. The DPD simulation parameters are chosen so that relevant dimensionless numbers (such as Reynolds number in flow simulations) or specific properties of fluid are preserved. Thermal fluctuations are still present in simulations, and therefore the method is typically used for modeling mesoscale systems.

The dual nature of the DPD method, which allows simulations of atomistic as well as mesoscopic systems, can be effectively utilized in multi-scale modeling approaches. In coupling of MD and continuum based methods (e.g., finite element), DPD can be used as an intermediate model, helping to bridge the gap between scales. On the other hand, coupling DPD itself with continuum solver will allow simulations of systems, in which the smallest resolved length and time scales will be controlled by the level of coarse-graining used in DPD. Uncertainties and unresolved small scale effects in the system then can be integrated into the stochastic nature of the DPD method. The difficulty and the effort required for such coupling should be similar to the coupling of MD and finite element method. However, due to the larger time scales in DPD, the hybrid multiscale system based on DPD will allow for larger simulation times as compared to MD based hybrid systems.

DPD has been applied to model many complex multiscale systems, including simulations of polymer solutions, brushes and melts [SHM95, MT00, Spe00], binary mixtures [CN96], amphiphilic systems [JBC$^+$99, SL02, PP14], and cells [PK08, PLP$^+$13]. Also, certain processes on the cellular level were modeled stochastically using multi-scale approaches in order to allow for a realistic yet simple description of complex behavior, for example see [PRK09].

3 Modeling Based Approaches

The multi-scale approaches presented in the previous sections are characterized by explicitly resolving the scales under investigation.

A first alternative to this approach is to pass information from the micro-scale to the macro-scale by homogenisation, i.e. by means of averaging of equations at the micro-scale. In contrast to the concurrent multi-scale models from Section 2.2, here the information transfer is unidirectional, i.e. only from micro to macro-scale.

A second alternative is the macroscopical modeling of the micro-scales. Macroscopical modelling considers the medium to consist of as many overlying continua as are the constituents in the system. Then, for each of the constituents the governing laws (usually continuity equations) are derived at the macroscopical level and coupling terms are added, which describe the interaction between the different constituents. In order to obtain a closed mathematical system, further hypotheses have to be introduced on the different components of the

system.

In some applications, such as theory of poroelasticity or biphasic materials, these approaches are believed to coincide. Indeed, under certain hypotheses these two methods may lead to the same system of equations [Sch03]. Here, we point out the importance of the microscopical approach, since the mechanical response of a biological material does not only depend on the material parameters but also on the microscopical geometry [FDH06].

As a third alternative, the micro-scale can be coupled to the macro-scale by incorporating it as a "driving force" in the description of a macro-scale process which is modeled on the continuous level (such as diffusion or mechanics). These models are widely used in, e.g., cardiac electrophysiology or cardiac electromechanics. We will refer to them as embedded approaches.

3.1 Homogenisation

Homogenisation usually refers to methods that starts from microscopical considerations and then, by means of averaging procedures, equations or problem parameters are upscaled to a coarser level [Glo12, Cha10]. In continuum based methods, homogenisation techniques assume the existence of a Representative Volume Element (RVE), which supplies information about the microscopical composition and structure of the heterogenous continua. Inside the RVE, continuity equations are defined under the hypothesis that the separation surfaces between the constituents are known. The microscopic solutions are obtained by means of volume- and mass-averages [HG89] and a system of equations at the macroscopical level is defined. In this process, also stochastic influences can be incorporated [BP04].

An alternative to analytical homogenisation can be found in numerical homogenisation. Here, using micro-scale simulations of RVEs, the relevant parameters are derived. We refer to [Cot13], where an iterative approach is described, in which the material parameters obtained for a stochastic micro-structure are updated in an iterative manner within a coupled simulation. Stochastic effects on the micro scale are also considered in [YCT$^+$08], where a statistical multiscale approach is presented, which aims at quantifying the influence of random material microstructure on material constitutive properties.

3.2 Micro-macro Modeling for Biological Tissues

In continuum biomechanics, the modeling of biological tissues strictly depends on their microstructure and composition. This holds particularly true for multiphase tissues such as cartilage [FGLR$^+$05], intervertebral discs [MNL11], heart walls [HvCAH91], and periodontal ligament [FGD$^+$11, Fav14, FBK14]. Indeed, a standard single-phase description is not satisfactory to reproduce their mechanical behaviour. The study of the effect of microstructure comes from the largely investigated field of material sciences. Here, a typical case study is the influence of pores on the overall response of the solid matrix.

From a mathematical standpoint, the arising model is a non-linear system of differential-algebraic equations. In its simplest form, it is given by a conservation of mass that governs the time evolution and a conservation of momentum that acts as a constraint on the motion. Implicit methods are hence a natural choice for the time integration in order to ensure the conservation properties [Gea84].

Consolidation problems of poroelastic biomaterials are characterized by a very rapid increase of pressure and then a relaxation of the tissues. In order to reproduce this very quick transient, a very short time step is needed and hence a large sequence of non-linear implicit problems has to be solved. The short time-step also imposes a very strict condition on the mesh size [FGK13] and hence suitable efficient solution method, such as non-linear multigrid or multigrid Newton's methods, have to be developed for the arising saddle-point problem.

The picture of poroelasticity becomes even more complicated when remodeling phenomena are included [GGF$^+$12]. In this case, the non-linear system is coupled with a tensorial ODE, whose coefficients depend on stress state of the material. Hence, suitable solvers as the return mapping algorithm [SH98] have to be adapted in this context.

In [FGLR$^+$05], the statistical orientation of fibers inside cartilage is modeled. The poroelasticity system is then coupled with an evolution equation that governs the mean orientation of the fibres.

3.3 Embedded Multi-scale Models

Another biological application where the homogenisation procedure is relevant comes from the modeling of cardiac electrophysiology. In the cardiac tissue, cells maintain a difference of ion concentration between the interior and exterior of the cell by means of active ionic (K^+ and Na^+) pumps. In consequence, a difference between the intra- and extra-cellular potential (known as membrane voltage) exists. Thus the cell membrane acts as an insulator. Since a cellular approach for the simulation of the heart would be unaffordable, mathematical homogenisation is a necessary tool for the simulation of heart [KS98]. This upscaling leads to a two-phase representation of the cardiac tissue where two equations describing the intra- and extra-cellular potential are defined on the same space. This system, known as bidomain equations, can be written in two different formulations: the parabolic-parabolic and the parabolic-elliptic.

A simplified version of this system (the monodomain equation) can be derived assuming that the intra- and extra-cellular conductivity tensors are linear dependent. Even though this assumption is usually not valid, monodomain simulations can approximate bidomain simulations well for large-scale models, [PDR$^+$06]. The monodomain equation is a diffusion problem with a non-linear reactive term depending on the ionic current. Hence, both mono- and bidomain equations have to be coupled at each point with a Hodgkin and Huxley-like model [HH52]. It is basically a system of ODEs that describes the dependance of the current on the ionic concentrations.

To include the stochastic effects and fluctuations in the behaviour of ion

channels, a probabilistic model was developed in [PCV+11]. Changes in temporal and spatial variability in cardiac repolarization were related to changes in the probability distribution.

A different approach to include variability in the ion channels has been proposed in [DKB12]. Here a continuous model that uses stochastic differential equations has been developed. This approach naturally encloses the interaction between cells and leads to global system of equations that can be efficiently solved.

The simulation of the monodomain equation is usually realised by means of semi-implicit methods. Often, the non-linear term is treated in an explicit way and the diffusive term implicitly. This also allows to employ explicit time integration for the ODEs describing ionic concentrations, thus realizing the multi-scale coupling.

The solution of monodomain equation is characterised by a travelling peak with steep gradient around the so called depolarisation region. It is localised in a relatively small zone while in the rest of the domain the solution is smooth. Capturing this travelling wave renders the simulation of the electrophysiology of the heart challenging due to a required high spatial resolution. In [KPD+12], an efficient adaptive strategy for large parallel machines has been developed. However, the refinement is controlled using error indicators, as reliable and efficient error estimators for this kind of problem are not yet available.

A first step towards the development of error estimators for this kind of coupled multi-scale problem may be the single-scale continuous formulation of electrophysiology recently presented in [HH14]. There, a variational formulation of cardiac electrophysiology is given which allows for a completely continuous formulation of the underlying multi-scale problem in terms of a minmax-problem. This formulation allows for deriving bounds for the time-steps below which the objective function is strictly convex, as it is highly beneficial from a numerical point of view.

4 Uncertainty Quantification

As discussed in the previous sections, many realistic applications are characterised by uncertainty. The source of uncertainty can be in the parameters of the problems (parameter uncertainty) or in the data of the problem (parameter variability). The former refers to variability in material parameters, external loadings, boundary conditions, and geometry, while the latter refers to the variability in the output of a model. A survey which also discusses available simulation tools is [LEE12].

Mathematically speaking, uncertainty quantification (UQ) models are characterised by a stochastic PDE with random coefficients and forcing term, and some known parameters. In the literature, this is sometimes referred to as a stochastic multi-scale problem. We therefore briefly summarise existing frameworks to reduce the dimensionality of these problems and enable a fast and accurate solution of them.

A straightforward approach to this problem consists in the introduction of a sampling of the parameter space and then in the solution for each subproblem of a PDE with deterministic coefficients. This method is affordable as long as the problem does not suffer the curse of dimensionality, i.e. the exponential increase of the samplings with the dimension of the parameter space.

An improvement to the parameter sampling is the stochastic collocation method (SCM) [BNT10, XH05]. The unknown parameters are assumed to depend on a finite number of random variables. Hence, a particular grid is introduced in the probability space and again some deterministic PDEs are solved. The particularity of this method consists in the fact that the choice of Gauß-points in the parameter space allows to solve independent problems in space and ensures exponential convergence.

In other applications, the variation is not only in the parameters, but the data of the problem can be random variables defined at each point of the computational domain. In this case, they are described not as random variables but as random fields. Hence, a possible method to approach this problem is to use the Karhunen-Loéve (KL) theorem [Loe78]. The idea is to write a stochastic process as the infinite sum of random variables - which can be interpreted as a stochastic Fourier series. Then, only a certain number of basis variables is employed to approximate the solution. Obviously, if the variability in the data is not large, few functions are sufficient to reproduce the random process and hence a SCM method can be employed for the solution.

A similar approach for solving stochastic differential equations or equations depending on random processes is the polynomial chaos (PC) [XK02, HS12]. The random process is expanded over Hermite-polynomials and it is approximated by a finite number of them. This method also shows exponential convergence. The application of both KL and PC requires a finite second moment of the random process while this hypothesis is not necessary for SCM.

A different approach for stochastic equations is the Monte Carlo Method (MCM). A sequence of problems is solved for random values of the unknown parameters. The solution is weighted with the probability of the outcome. MCM is a very robust method but it is slow in convergence ($O(N^{-\frac{1}{2}})$) where N is the dimension of the sampling. Convergence is independent on the dimension of the considered random variables. The changes on the probability distribution of the random coefficients or pseudo-random sequences may improve the convergence but do not change the order.

An improvement of this method is the Quasi-Monte Carlo Method (QMCM). It employs low-discrepancy sequences instead of random, or pseudo-random, ones. In this case, sequences of parameters are not randomly chosen, but they are correlated ensuring an order of convergence of $(O(N^{-1}(\log\ N)^k))$.

A simple yet attractive possibility for creating an even more cost effective sampling procedure is the multilevel Monte Carlo method for elliptic stochastic partial differential equations [HPS13] which allows to solve problems with this structure.

Stochastic PDEs are even more challenging when the problem has also a multi-scale structure. The multi-scale nature arises when the material param-

eters have many small inclusions that are randomly distributed or when the covariance function has a sharp peak. In this case, the construction of a reduced basis with PC or KL requires a large number of polynomials. In order to characterise the influence of material properties on the micro-scale, various multi-scale models for uncertainty quantification have been developed, cf. [PS14, CPL13]. Here, the stochastic models on the micro-scale are mainly used for characterising unknown material properties.

We finally note that a purely probabilistic model for material fatigue and formation of micro-cracks has been presented in [Sch13]. The model is derived from reliability statistics and takes into account size effects, inhomogeneous strain, and thermal effect. Interestingly, this model acts as a "probabilistic post-processor" on data created by deterministic macro-scale simulations.

5 Multi-scale in High Performance Computing

With respect to the realisation of multi-scale approaches in terms of simulation software, the main difficulty is arguably the fact that most of the existing simulation softwares have been written with a single-physics or single-scale application in mind. Thus, exploiting the available computational power in the context of multi-scale simulations turns out to be difficult, as specially tailored algorithms have to be designed and implemented, which are capable of dealing with the massive parallelism of current and upcoming supercomputers. This holds in particularly true if different simulation methods - like MD for the micro-scale and finite elements for the macro-scale - have to be intertwined. As a matter of fact, their efficient simultaneous usage within a common simulation framework is far from trivial, see, e.g., [KK11].

In fact, many multi-scale simulations are usually carried out by combining different codes through more or less elaborated interfaces. We refer to [GBBC+13]. Following this approach, data has to be transferred between the different scales (or simulation codes), see Figure 2. This is usually done in a



Figure 2: Data exchange between different simulation tools.

sequential way, as the progress of the simulation on one scale will depend on the progress of the simulation on a different scale. One possibility to improve the computational speed is to advance the faster scale independently from the slower scale by doing a multi-rate time integration, cf., e.g., [SM10]. With respect to scalability on massively parallel machines, however, the inherently sequential approach used for the realisation of many multi-scale simulations can limit dramatically the scalability. For example, for the coupling of MD and finite elements, in [KK11] two parallel simulation tools have been coupled using a parallel scale transfer. Nevertheless, the originally good scaling of the two simulation tools when used "stand-alone" could not be maintained. This is simply due to the fact that the respective computational demands of the simulations on the employed scales are substantiably different and, combined with the scale transfer, do not allow for a good load balancing.

Within the framework of MD and particle-based CG models, the situation is less severe, as both models are relatively similar. Thus, by now efficient softwares for MD simulations (GROMACS, LAMMPS) as well as approaches for their efficient coupling [GV14] exist. However, as explained above, this relatively good behavior can not be transferred to multi-scale simulations including different models as, e.g., MD and finite elements.

When different models are intertwined nicely as for example in the case of cardiac electrophysiology, excellent scalability can be achieved on current supercomputer architectures, see, e.g., [KPD$^+$12]. This is possible since the smaller scale, i.e. the models for the ion-channels, can be seamlessly integrated into the finite element method used for the diffusive part of the mono- or bi-domain equation. The integration is done by simply solving a set of ODEs at each mesh node or at each quadrature point. As this additional work load is completely local and moreover scales nicely with the number of degrees of freedom for the finite element simulation, massively parallel machines can be used efficiently.

From the above examples it is clear that the possibility to use massively parallel supercomputers will heavily depend on the type of the multi-scale model and on its characteristics. To put it simply, the better the different scales can be intertwined, the more likely good scalability will be.

Making the computational power of large machines available for truly heterogeneous multi-scale simulations thus remains a significant challenge. Coupling existing codes is possible, but can lead to a drastic loss in scalability. The ongoing trend in supercomputing towards heterogeneous hardware (CPU, accelerators, GPUs, shared memory, distributed memory,...) and the corresponding diversification in terms of programming tools (OpenCL, CUDA, OpenMP, MPI,...) will make it moreover necessary to provide highly specific implementations. A possible remedy here could be to use asynchronous solution methods as stochastic solution methods, as those might allow for obtaining good scalability even for the strongly heterogeneous demands of multi-scale simulations.

6 Conclusions

Clearly, multi-scale models allow for the treatment of complex phenomena involving different scales, such as, e.g., remodeling and growth of tissues (wound or bone healing, tumor growth, in-stent restenosis), muscular activation, or cardiac electrophysiology.

Numerous new numerical approaches have been developed to simulate multi-scale problems. However, if compared to the by now well elaborated simulation methods for "classical"problems, such as computational mechanics and fluid mechanics, in the numerical simulation of (stochastic) multi-scale problems still many questions have to be answered.
Particularly interesting aspects in the analysis of multi-scale methods are

- to move away from "single-trajectory view";
- scale transfer;
- properties and stability of the coupled system;
- incorporation of stochastic effects;
- consistent definition of a coupled multi-scale problem;
- uncertainty quantification and sensitivity to perturbations, also for coupled multi-scale models;
- parameter estimation for coupled multi-scale models.

New approaches in numerical analysis are desirable to

- choose discretisation or discrete model;
- define and estimate discretisation error and error in physical modeling;
- control convergence, error, and accuracy;
- get a posteriori error estimation and adaptivity;
- exploit parallelism for strongly heterogeneous models;
- obtain scalability of solution methods and efficient solution;
- develop fast and reliable coupled solution methods;
- generalize and unify approaches to scale transfer.

Moreover, the interaction of data with computational models is an issue. Here, data driven simulation, in which a simulation run is forced to optimally match the available data (measured or acquired in real time), might be an interesting option.

On the computational side, the combination of different simulation tools gives rise to severe technical difficulties such as the simple exchange of data between different simulation codes, the control of iterative processes, and the introduction of appropriate stopping criteria.

In terms of high performance computing, coupled methods will have to be developed which will show good scaling behavior even on the upcoming exascale machines. Such methods are currently not available, at least not to the knowledge of the authors.

Summing up, it therefore can be argued that the huge potential of multi-scale simulations can be exploited best, if appropriate new concepts and ideas

in numerical analysis will be developed, which will have to be accompanied by new improvements both of algorithms and, of course, of simulation softwares.

It could be speculated that, in view of the growing core counts, also asynchronous and/or stochastic algorithms might be better suited for the numerical simulation of heterogeneous multi-scale problems on the upcoming large scale machines.

Acknowledgement

I.V.P. acknowledges support by the Swiss Platform for Advanced Scientific Computing grant and a grant from the Swiss SystemsX.ch initiative within the framework of the ERA-Net ERASysAPP. R.K. acknowledges support by the Swiss Platform for High Performance Computing (PASC) and by the SNF through the project "A Flexible High Performance Approach to Cardiac Electromechanics".

References

[AG05] M. Arndt and M. Griebel. Derivation of Higher Order Gradient Continuum Models and Atomistic Models for Crystalline Solids. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 4(2):531–562, 2005.

[AvLM+08] P. Arbenz, G. H. van Lenthe, U. Mennel, R. Müller, and M. Sala. A scalable multi-level preconditioner for matrix-free μ-finite element analysis of human bone structures. *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Engrg.*, 73(7):927–947, 2008.

[BABK99] J. Broughton, F. Abraham, N. Bernstein, and E. Kaxiras. Concurrent coupling of length scales: methodology and application. *Phys. Rev. B*, 60(8):2391–2403, 1999.

[BCC+04] P. Bochev, M. Christon, S. Collins, R. Lehoucq, J. Shadid, A. Slepoy, and G. Wagner. A Mathematical Framework for Multiscale Science and Engineering: The Variational Multiscale Method and Interscale Transfer Operators. Technical Report SAND2004-2671, Sandia National Laboratories, 2004.

[BL05] Marc R. Benioff and Edward D. Lazowska. Computational science: Ensuring america's comptetitiveness. Technical report, Report of the US President's Information Technology Advisory Committee, 2005.

[BLL02] X. Blanc, C. LeBris, and P. Lions. From molecular models to continuum mechanics. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, 164(4):341–381, 2002.

[BNT10] I. Babuka, F. Nobile, and R. Tempone. A stochastic collocation method for elliptic partial differential equations with random input data. *SIAM Review*, 52(2):317–355, 2010.

[BP04] Alain Bourgeat and Andrey Piatnitski. Approximations of effective coefficients in stochastic homogenization. *Ann. I. H. Poincare*, 40:153–165, 2004.

[Cha10] Nicolas Charalambakis. Homogenization techniques and micromechanics. a survey and perspectives. *Appl. Mech. Rev.*, 63, 2010.

[CM03] W. A. Curtin and R. E. Miller. Atomistic/continuum coupling in computational materials science. *Modelling Simul. Mater. Sci. Engrg.*, 11(3):R33–R68, 2003.

[CN96] P. V. Coveney and K. E. Novik. Computer simulations of domain growth and phase separation in two-dimensional binary immiscible fluids using dissipative particle dynamics. *Physical Review E*, 54(5):5134–5141, 1996.

[Cot13] Rgis Cottereau. A stochastic-deterministic coupling method for multiscale problems. application to numerical homogenization of random materials. *Procedia {IUTAM}*, 6(0):35 – 43, 2013. {IUTAM} Symposium on Multiscale Problems in Stochastic Mechanics.

[CPL13] Aleksandr Chernatynskiy, Simon R. Phillpot, and Richard LeSar. Uncertainty quantification in multiscale simulation of materials: A prospective. *Annual Review of Materials Research*, 43:157–182, 2013.

[CWM10] D. Christen, D. J. Webster, and R. Müller. Multiscale modelling and nonlinear finite element analysis as clinical tools for the assessment of fracture risk. *Philos Transact A Math Phys Eng Sci*, 368(1920):2653–68, Jun 13 2010. Christen, David Webster, Duncan James Muller, Ralph England Philosophical transactions. Series A, Mathematical, physical, and engineering sciences Philos Transact A Math Phys Eng Sci. 2010 Jun 13;368(1920):2653-68.

[DA12a] Avisek Das and Hans. C. Andresen. The multiscale coarse-graining method. ix. A general method for the construction of three-body coarse-grained force fields. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 136:194114, 2012.

[DA12b] Avisek Das and Hans. C. Andresen. The multiscale coarse-graining method. viii. Multiresolution hierarchical basis funcions and basis function selection in the construction of coarse-grained force fields. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 136:194113, 2012.

[Dhi98] H. Ben Dhia. Multiscale mechanical problems: the arlequin method. *Comptes Rendus de lAcademie des Sciences - Series IIB*, 326(12):899–904, 1998.

[DKB12] C. Dangerfield, D. Kay, and K. Burrage. Modeling ion channel dynamics through reflected stochastic differential equations. *Physical Review E*, 85(5), 2012.

[EA94] Furio Ercolessi and J. B. Adams. Interatomic potential from first-principles calculations: the Force-Matching method. *Europh. Lett.*, 26:583–588, 1994.

[ELVE04] W. E, X. Li, and E. Vanden-Eijden. Some Recent Progress in Multiscale Modelling. In S. Attiner and P. Koumoutsakos, editors, *Multiscale Modelling and Simulation*, volume 39 of *Leture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering*, pages 3–22. Springer, 2004.

[Esp95] P. Espanol. Hydrodynamics from dissipative particle dynamics. *Physical Review E*, 52(2):1734–1742, 1995.

[EW95] P. Espanol and P. Warren. Statistical-mechanics of dissipative particle dynamics. *Europhys. Lett.*, 30(4):191, 1995.

[Fav14] M. Favino. *Derivation, Simulation and Validation of Poroelastic Models in Dental Biomechanics*. PhD thesis, Universitá della Svizzera italiana, 2014.

[FBK14] M. Favino, C. Bourauel, and R. Krause. A non-linear poroelastic model of the periodontal ligament. *submitted to International Journal of Computational Methods in Engineering Science and Mechanics*, 2014.

[FDH06] Andreas Fritsch, Luc Dormieux, and Christian Hellmich. Porous polycrystals built up by uniformly and axisymmetrically oriented needles: homogenization of elastic properties. *Comptes Rendus Mcanique*, 334(3):151 – 157, 2006.

[FGD+11] M. Favino, C. Gross, M. Drolshagen, L. Keilig, J. Deschner, C. Bourauel, and R. Krause. Validation of a heterogeneous elastic-biphasic model for the numerical simulation of the PDL. *Computer Methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering*, 2011. to appear.

[FGK13] M. Favino, A. Grillo, and R. Krause. *A Stability Condition for the Numerical Simulation of Poroelastic Systems*, chapter 110, pages 919–928. American Society of Civil Engineers, 2013.

[FGLR+05] S. Federico, A. Grillo, G. La Rosa, G. Giaquinta, and W. Herzog. A transversely isotropic, transversely homogeneous microstructural-statistical model of articular cartilage. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 38(10):2008 – 2018, 2005.

[FKKL11] Konstantin Fackeldey, Dorian Krause, Rolf Krause, and Christoph Lenzen. Coupling molecular dynamics and continua with weak constraints. *SIAM Journal on Multiscale Modeling & Simulation*, 9(4):1459–1494, 2011.

[GBBC+13] D. Groen, J. Borgdorff, C. Bona-Casas, J. Hetherington, R. W. Nash, S. J. Zasada, I. Saverchenko, M. Mamonski, K. Kurowski, M. O. Bernabeu, and A. G. Hoekstra P. V. Coveney. MAPPER: Flexible composition and execution of high performance, high fidelity multiscale biomedical simulations. *Interface Focus*, 3, 2013. http://rsfs.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/3/2/20120087.short.

[Gea84] C.W. Gear. Differential-algebraic equations. In EdwardJ. Haug, editor, *Computer Aided Analysis and Optimization of Mechanical System Dynamics*, volume 9 of *NATO ASI Series*, pages 323–334. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1984.

[GGF+12] A. Grillo, C. Giverso, M. Favino, R. Krause, M. Lampe, and G. Wittum. Mass transport in porous media with variable mass. In J.M.P.Q. Delgado, Antonio Gilson Barbosa Lima, and Marta Vazquez Silva, editors, *Numerical Analysis of Heat and Mass Transfer in Porous Media*, volume 27 of *Advanced Structured Materials*, pages 27–61. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012.

[Glo12] Antoine Gloria. Numerical homogenization: survey, new results, and perspectives. *ESAIM: Proceedings*, 37:50–116, September 2012.

[GR01] R. D. Groot and K. L. Rabone. Mesoscopic simulation of cell membrane damage, morphology change and rupture by nonionic surfactants. *Biophys. J.*, 81(2):725, 2001.

[Gro00] R. D. Groot. Mesoscopic simulation of polymer-surfactant aggregation. *Langmuir*, 16(19):7493, 2000.

[GSS+14] S. Grein, M. Stepniewski, S.Reiter, M. Knodel, and G. Queisser. 1d-3d hybrid modelling - from multi-compartment models to full resolution models in space and time. *Front. Neuroinform.*, 8(68), 2014.

[GV14] John. M. A. Grime and Gregory A. Voth. Highly scalable and memory efficient ultra-coarse-grained molecular dynamics

simulations. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 10(1):423–431, 2014.

[GW97] R. D. Groot and P. B. Warren. Dissipative particle dynamics: Bridging the gap between atomistic and mesoscopic simulation. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 107(11):4423, 1997.

[GWvLM09] Friederike A. Gerhard, Duncan J. Webster, G. Harry van Lenthe, and Ralph Mller. In silico biology of bone modelling and remodelling: adaptation. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A*, 2009.

[GZC14] D. Groen, S. J. Zasada, and P.V. Coveney. Survey of multiscale and multiphysics applications and communities. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, 16(2), 2014.

[HG89] S. M. Hassanizadeh and W. G. Gray. Derivation of Conditions Describing Transport Across Zones of Reduced Dynamics Within Multiphase Systems. *Water Resources Research*, 25:529–539, 1989.

[HH52] A. L. Hodgkin and A. F. Huxley. A quantitative description of membrane current and its application to conduction and excitation in nerve. *The Journal of Physiology*, 117(4):500–544, 1952.

[HH14] Daniel E. Hurtado and Duvan Henao. Gradient flows and variational principles for cardiac electrophysiology: Toward efficient and robust numerical simulations of the electrical activity of the heart. *Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 273:238–254, 2014.

[HK92] P. J. Hoogerbrugge and J. M. V. A. Koelman. Simulating microscopic hydrodynamic phenomena with dissipative particle dynamics. *Europhys. Lett.*, 19(3):155, 1992.

[HLW00] E. Haier, C. Lubich, and G. Wanner. *Geometric Numerical Integration*. Springer, second edition, 2000.

[HPS13] Helmut Harbrecht, Michael Peters, and Markus Siebenmorgen. On multilevel quadrature for elliptic stochastic partial differential equations. In Jochen Garcke and Michael Griebel, editors, *Sparse Grids and Applications*, volume 88 of *Lecture Notes in Computational Science and Engineering*, pages 161–179. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2013.

[HS12] VIET HA HOANG and CHRISTOPH SCHWAB. Regularity and generalized polynomial chaos approximation of parametric and random second-order hyperbolic partial differential equations. *Analysis and Applications*, 10(03):295–326, 2012.

[HvCAH91] J. M. Huyghe, D. H. van Campen, T. Arts, and R. M. Heethaar. A two-phase finite element model of the diastolic left ventricle. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 24(7):527 – 538, 1991.

[IPBV04] Sergei Izvekov, Michele Parrinello, Christian J. Burnham, and Gregory A. Voth. Effective force field for condensed phase systems: A new method for force-matching. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 120:10896–10913, 2004.

[IV05] Sergei Izvekov and Gregory A. Voth. A Multiscale Coarse-Graining Method for Biomolecular Systems. *J. Phys. Chem. B. Letters*, 109:2469–2473, 2005.

[JBC+99] S. Jury, P. Bladon, M. Cates, S. Krishna, M. Hagen, N. Ruddock, and P. Warren. Simulation of amphiphilic mesophases using dissipative particle dynamics. *Phys Chem Chem Phys*, 1(9):2051–2056, 1999.

[KJ10] Rolf Krause and Steiner Johannes. Cosserat-rods and elastic bodies: On the numerical simulation of a coupled system. In John Middleton and Christopher Jacobs, editors, *CMBBE2010 : 9th International Symposium on Computer methods in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering, Valencia, Spain*, Valencia, Spain, November 2010. Arup, Solihull.

[KK11] Dorian Krause and Rolf Krause. Parallel scale-transfer in multiscale MD-FE coupling using remote memory access. In *e-Science Workshops*, pages 66–73, 2011.

[KMV03] Markos A. Katsoulakis, Andrew J. Majda, and Dionisios G. Vlachos. Coarse-grained stochastic processes and monte carlo simulations in lattice systems. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 186:250–278, 2003.

[KPD+12] Dorian Krause, Mark Potse, Thomas Dickopf, Rolf Krause, Angelo Auricchio, and Frits Prinzen. Hybrid parallelization of a large-scale heart model. In Rainer Keller, David Kramer, and Jan-Philipp Weiss, editors, *Facing the Multicore - Challenge II*, volume 7174 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 120–132. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. Available as ICS Preprint 2011-04.

[KPMK05] E. E. Keaveny, I. V. Pivkin, M. Maxey, and G. E. Karniadakis. A comparative study between dissipative particle dynamics and molecular dynamics for simple- and complex-geometry flows. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 123(10):104107, 2005.

[KS98] James Keener and James Sneyd. *Mathematical Physiology*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, NY, USA, 1998.

[LCGP06] Damien Lacroix, Arnaud Chateau, Maria-Pau Ginebra, and Josep A. Planell. Micro-finite element models of bone tissue-engineering scaffolds. *Biomaterials*, 27(30):5326 – 5334, 2006.

[LEE12] G. Lin, D. W. Engel, and P. W. Esliner. Survey and evaluate uncertainty quantification methodologies. Technical Report PNNL-20914, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington, 2012.

[Loe78] M. Loeve. *Probability theory*. Springer, 1978.

[LQG+10] Wing Kam Liu, Dong Qian, Stefano Gonella, Shaofan Li, Wei Chen, and Shardool Chirputkar. Multiscale methods for mechanical science of complex materials: Bridging from quantum to stochastic multiresolution continuum. *Int. J. Numer. Meth. Engng*, 83(8-9):10391080, 2010.

[MBF+00] Hendrik Meyer, Oliver Biermann, Roland Fallera, Dirk Reith, and Florian Mller-Plathe. Coarse graining of nonbonded interparticle potentials using automatic simplex optimization to fit structural properties. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 113:6264–6275, 2000.

[MdVM04] Siewert J. Marrink, Alex. H. de Vries, and Alan E. Mark. Coarse grained model for semiquantitative lipid simulations. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, 108(2):750–760, 2004.

[MFP+04] Teem Murtola, Emma Falck, Michael Patra, Mikko Kartuunen, and Ilpo Vattulainen. Coarse-grained model for phosholipid/cholesterol bilayer. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 121:9156, 2004.

[MKP+08] Luca Monticelli, Senthil K. Kandasamy, Xavier Periole, Ronald G. Larson, D. Peter Tielman, and Siewert J. Marrink. The MARTINI Coarse-Grained Force Field: Extension to Protein. *J. Chem. T. Comp.*, 4:819–834, 2008.

[MKSB11] CP May, E Kolokotroni, Stamatakos, and P. Büchler. Coupling biomechanics to a cellular level model: an approach to patient-specific image driven multi-scale and multi-physics tumor simulation. *Prog Biophys Mol Biol.*, 2011.

[MNL11] Andrea Malandrino, Jrme Noailly, and Damien Lacroix. The effect of sustained compression on oxygen metabolic transport in the intervertebral disc decreases with degenerative changes. *PLoS Computational Biology*, 7(8), 2011.

[MRY+07] Siewert J. Marrink, H. Jelger Risselada, Serge Yefimov, D. Peter Toeleman, and Alex H. de Vries. The MARTINI Force Field: Coarse-Grained Model for Biomolecular Simulations. *J. Phys. Chem. B.*, 111:7812–7824, 2007.

[MT00] P. Malfreyt and D. J. Tildesley. Dissipative particle dynamics simulations of grafted polymer chains between two walls. *Langmuir*, 16(10):4732–4740, 2000.

[NaGSAK+08a] W. G. Noid, Jhih-Wei Chu adn Gary S. Ayton, Vind Krishna, Sergei Izvekov, Gregory A. Voth, Avisek Das, and Hans C. Andrsen. The multiscale coarse-graining method. i. A rigorous bridge between atomistic and coarse-grained models. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 128:244114, 2008.

[NaGSAK+08b] W. G. Noid, Jhih-Wei Chu adn Gary S. Ayton, Vind Krishna, Sergei Izvekov, Gregory A. Voth, Avisek Das, and Hans C. Andrsen. The multiscale coarse-graining method. ii. A rigorous bridge between atomistic and coarse-grained models. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 128:244115, 2008.

[NLSK04] Steve O. Nielsen, Carlos F. Lopez, Goundla Srinivas, and Michael L. Klein. Coarse Grained models and computer simulation of soft matters. *J. Phys. Cond. Matt.*, 16:481–512, 2004.

[PCK10] I. V. Pivkin, B. Caswell, and G. E. Karniadakis. Dissipative particle dynamics. In *Reviews in Computational Chemistry*, pages 85–110. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2010.

[PCV+11] Esther Pueyo, Alberto Corrias, Laszlo Virag, Norbert Jost, Tamas Szel, Andras Varro, Norbert Szentandrassy, Peter P. Nanasi, Kevin Burrage, and Blanca Rodrguez. A multiscale investigation of repolarization variability and its role in cardiac arrhythmogenesis. *Biophysical Journal*, 2011.

[PdLF+09] Tiziano Passerini, Mariarita de Luca, Luca Formaggia, Alfio Quarteroni, and Alessandro Veneziani. A 3d/1d geometrical multiscale model of cerebral vasculature. *Journal of Engineering Mathematics*, 2009.

[PDR+06] M. Potse, B. Dube, J. Richer, A. Vinet, and R.M. Gulrajani. A comparison of monodomain and bidomain reaction-diffusion models for action potential propagation in the human heart. *Biomedical Engineering, IEEE Transactions on*, 53(12):2425–2435, Dec 2006.

[PK06] I. V. Pivkin and G. E. Karniadakis. Coarse-graining limits in open and wall-bounded dissipative particle dynamics systems. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 124(18):184101, 2006.

[PK08] I.V. Pivkin and G.E. Karniadakis. Accurate coarse-grained modeling of red blood cells. *Physical Review Letters*, 101, 2008.

[PL04] H. S. Park and W. K. Liu. An introduction and tutorial on multiple scale analysis in solids. *Comp. Meth. Appl. Mech. Engrg.*, 193(17-20):1733–1772, 2004.

[PLP+13] Z. L. Peng, X. J. Li, I. V. Pivkin, M. Dao, G. E. Karniadakis, and S. Suresh. Lipid bilayer and cytoskeletal interactions in a red blood cell. *P Natl Acad Sci USA*, 110(33):13356–13361, 2013.

[PP14] Emanuel K. Peter and Igor V. Pivkin. A polarizable coarse-grained water model for dissipative particle dynamics. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 141(16):164506, 2014.

[PRK06] I. V. Pivkin, P. D. Richardson, and G. Karniadakis. Blood flow velocity effects and role of activation delay time on growth and form of platelet thrombi. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 103 (46),*, 103(46):17164–17169, 2006.

[PRK09] I. V. Pivkin, P. D. Richardson, and G. E. Karniadakis. Effect of red blood cells on platelet aggregation. *Ieee Eng Med Biol*, 28(2):32–37, 2009.

[PS14] Manolis Papadrakakis and George Stefanou, editors. *Proceedings of the IUTAM Symposium held at Santorini, Greece, September 9-11, 2013.*, 2014.

[Sch03] M. Schanz. On the equivalence of the linear biots theory and the linear theory of porous media. *ASCE Engineering Mechanics Conference*, 2003.

[Sch13] S. Schmitz. *A Local and Probabilistic Model for Low-Cycle Fatigue – New Aspects of Structural Analysis.* PhD thesis, Universitá della Svizzera italiana, 2013.

[SDS+14] Erich Strohmaier, Jack Dongarra, Horst Simon, Martin Meuer, and Hans Meuer. Top 500 list, 2014. http://www.top500.org/lists/2014/11/.

[SH98] J. C. Simo and T. J. R. Hughes. *Compuational Inelasticity.* Springer Verlag, 1998.

[SHM95] A. G. Schlijper, P. J. Hoogerbrugge, and C. W. Manke. Computer-simulation of dilute polymer-solutions with the dissipative particle dynamics method. *Journal of Rheology*, 39(3):567–579, 1995.

[SL02] Julian C. Shillcock and Reinhard Lipowsky. Equilibrium structure and lateral stress distribution of amphiphilic bilayers from dissipative particle dynamics simulations. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 117(10):5048, 2002.

[SM10] V. Savcenco and R. M. M. Mattheij. Multirate numerical integration for stiff odes. In *Progress in Industrial Mathematics at ECMI 2008*, pages 327–332, 2010.

[Spe00] N. A. Spenley. Scaling laws for polymers in dissipative particle dynamics. *Europhys Lett*, 49(4):534–540, 2000.

[SSR+01] John C. Shelley, Mee Y. Shelley, Robert C. Reeder, Sanjoy Bandyopadhyay, and Michael L. Klein. A Coarse Grain Model for Phospholipid Simulations. *J. Phys. Chem. B.*, 105:4464–4470, 2001.

[TMBM94] J S Thomsen, Li Mosekilde, R W Boyce, and E Mosekilde. Stochastic simulation of vertebral trabecular bone remodeling. *Bone*, 15(6):655–666, November 1994.

[Tro03] S. Y. Trofimov. *Thermodynamic Consistency in Dissipative Particle Dynamics*. PhD thesis, Eindhoven University of Technology, 2003.

[VG12] F. J. Vermolen and A. Gefen. A semi-stochastic cell-based formalism to model the dynamics of migration of cells in colonies. *Biomech Model Mechanobiol*, 11:183–195, 2012.

[VG13] F. J. Vermolen and A. Gefen. *Multiscale Computer Modeling in Biomechanics and Biomedical Engineering.*, volume 14 of *(Studies in Mechanobiological Engineering*, chapter Wound healing: multi-scale modeling, pages 321–345. Springer, 2013.

[Vot09] Gregory A. Voth, editor. *Coarse-Graining of Condened Phase and Biomolecular Systems*. CRC Press, Taylor and Francis Group, Raton Boca, 2009.

[WL03] G. J. Wagner and W. K. Liu. Coupling of atomistic and continuum simulations using a bridging scale decomposition. *J. Comp. Phys.*, 190(1):249–274, 2003.

[XH05] Dongbin Xiu and Jan S. Hesthaven. High-order collocation methods for differential equations with random inputs. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, 2005.

[XK02] D. Xiu and G. Karniadakis. The wiener–askey polynomial chaos for stochastic differential equations. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 24(2):619–644, 2002.

[YCT+08] X. Yin, W. Chen, A. C. To, C. McVeigh, and W. K. Liu. Statistical volume element method for predicting microstructure-constitutive property relations. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, 2008.